

Minutes
Professional Standards Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, September 30, 2010
10am

The September 30, 2010 meeting of the Professional Standards Advisory Board was called to order by Secretary Jason Woebkenberg at 10:10 a.m. All members except Susan Julian were in attendance. Mr. Woebkenberg led the board in the Pledge of Allegiance. The first action was a motion to approve the minutes of the July 29, 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Mr. Woebkenberg moved to the first item of new business, asking Mr. Mapes to introduce the licensing report. Mr. Mapes explained that the Office of Educator Licensing is required to submit a licensing activity report annually to the legislature and he asked Ms. Regnier to present the report to the board. Ms. Regnier highlighted the information in the full report that was sent electronically to the board. The report includes summary information on Emergency Permits, Substitute Permits, Transition to Teaching permits, Initial, Proficient and Accomplished licenses under Rules 2002, REPA licenses, and additions based on Praxis testing since May 2010. Ms. Regnier explained that the content areas in which we issue the most Emergency Permits will be reported to the US DOE by Dec. 15 for use in federal grant programs to encourage teachers to pursue licensure in shortage areas and to teach in hard-to-staff schools. Dr. Van Horn asked why there is a shortage in special needs areas and suggested that is an area that needs to be examined. Dr. Johnstone commented that it may be because special needs areas are desirable dual licensure areas with elementary education. Ms. Riehl noted that teachers who don't get hired in their initial licensure areas often seek to add special needs areas to become more marketable. She also noted that the number of Initial Practitioner licenses seems higher than in previous years. Ms. Regnier explained that a review of historical data would show trends for Initial Practitioner licenses. Dr. Johnstone asked if OELD has data on the effect of Praxis additions on Emergency Permits. Ms. Regnier said that some Emergency Permit applications are being received to allow teachers time to take and pass Praxis tests to make additions, but data is not collected separately for Emergency Permits issued for that reason. Dr. Van Horn observed that it would be interesting to calculate the percentage of teachers in each school district that are teaching on Emergency Permits, particularly special needs teachers.

Mr. Woebkenberg introduced Matt Tusing, Office of Legal Services, to present the draft of a proposed rule for certification of Educational Interpreters for action. A sign language interpreter was present for this discussion. Mr. Tusing explained that there were three actions the board could take: vote to adopt the draft as is; amend the draft and then vote on it; or, go back to the drawing board. Mr. Tusing reiterated that adopting a draft today only moves the proposed rule forward for publication as the basis of a future public hearing and public comment period. He explained the timeline for publication, hearing, adoption and review/approval by other agencies before the rule can be effective in time for July 1, 2011 when the DOE assumes responsibility for certifying Educational Interpreters. Mr. Tusing then presented a brief summary of the proposed rule. The rule, in general, provides for a 2 year permit that is renewable based on completion of professional development; the rule also provides for an emergency permit to be issued. The sections of the proposed rule establish the purpose and scope of the rule, creates the permit, describes the application process, sets forth eligibility requirements that include proficiency as determined by a minimum score on a national assessment, specifies renewal requirements, provides for an emergency permit and specifies eligibility for such, establishes an EI code of ethics, and provides for the grandfathering of EIs certified under prior rules. Mr. Tusing went through each section briefly.

Ms. Koehler asked about the number of hours of professional development required for renewal. Mr. Tusing explained that over a five-year period EIs would be completing 10 hours more professional development than teachers. Ms. Regnier noted that the proposed rule does not increase the number of hours of professional development required for renewal over the prior Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services (DHHS) rules, but the hours are reported as professional growth points rather than as CEUs. Professional development opportunities approved for interpreters in other settings remain available for educational interpreters to take, and Dr. Van Horn explained how his district has collaborated with others in the SE part of the state to provide EI professional development, too. Dr. Van Horn suggested that the professional growth points required annually for renewal be changed from 20 to 18 in order to have the number of professional growth points over five years correspond to the requirements for teachers under REPA, which is 90. Mr. Zoeller asked if college course work could be completed for EI renewal and Ms. Regnier said it could, but there is still be a requirement for skill development activities. Mr. Daghe wondered if it is appropriate to have the building level administrator verify professional growth activities for renewal when the interpreter might be working in multiple buildings. Mr. Tusing explained that an employer can decide which administrator works most closely with the EI to determine who should verify professional development activities for renewal.

Dr. Van Horn asked about quality control on professional development activities and noted there needs to be an external check. Dr. Johnstone said she understood that DHHS was no longer in an approval role for EI professional development activities; however DHHS still approves CEU programs for interpreters in other settings. Dr. Oliver noted that responsibility for assessing the quality of professional development for renewal lies with the building level administrator. Mr. Mapes asked if the wording should be “building level administrator” or “appropriate administrator?” Discussion ensued with the consensus being to use the phrase “appropriate corporation level administrator.”

Mr. Woebkenberg asked if there were further questions. When none were voiced he asked for a motion to approve the proposed rule with all amendments and to move it forward for publication. A motion was made and seconded and the proposed amended rule passed unanimously. Dr. Bennett left the meeting.

The next item of business was a presentation concerning the development of the teacher standards by Pearson Evaluation Systems. Ms. Barbara Appel gave a brief overview and noted that the presentation was divided into three parts and each would be presented by a member of the project team. First, Ms. Nancy Hahn presented a progress report. She noted that standards are being custom developed for 46 content areas and 5 developmental levels; the standards will be broad yet concise, significant, present a coherent unified vision of the knowledge and skills needed by beginning Indiana educators, will emphasize content knowledge, and will align to the common core state standards, state academic standards and national professional organization standards. During the course of developing the draft standards, two rounds of reviews—for a total of 550 individual reviews--were conducted by Indiana educators. Following preliminary reviews, revisions and refinements were made to wording, content and organization. During a second coordinated review of the standards, the selected bibliographies and correlation tables were included. Now the draft standards are ready for the board to review, with final adoption expected in December. Pearson ES also made efforts for outreach to teacher preparation program leaders; on September 3 it conducted a conference call with IACTE members to answer questions about the standards and how they will be used by Indiana teacher preparation institutions, etc., and on October 8 the elementary content and developmental standards will be shared with IACTE at its October members’ meeting for feedback. The draft standards were also shared with the National Council for Teacher Quality, which had positive comments.

An overview of the structure of the standards was presented by Dr. Steve Weiss. He shared with the board the similarities and differences across the standards and talked about the partnership and collaboration that went into their development. He commented that he was enormously impressed by the amount of thoroughness

and care that Indiana teachers and educators have given their reviews of the draft standards. Dr. Weiss explained that the standards developers faced the dual challenge of bringing dozens of disparate fields into a common structure while still defining the content in ways that made sense for the particular fields. Consequently, within the common structure there are some variations based on whether the standards are content or developmental, instructional approaches, and the nature of the individual content areas. Dr. Weiss emphasized that in areas that have undergone a significant shift in philosophy and/or approach in recent years, decisions on how to present the content were made jointly between Pearson and the DOE. Dr. Weiss then walked the board through the government standards to illustrate the standards structure and format. He noted that in most of the content areas the essential elements can be expressed in a fairly concise way; however, the developmental standards and a few content standards--like reading--required greater elaboration of essential elements.

Ms. Shannon White walked the board through an overview of the reading standards. Key features of the reading standards are the foundation of scientifically based reading research (SBRR), alignment to state and national standards—such as national IRA standards for MS and literacy coaches for HS, alignment to the ELA Common Core standards, and implementation of Indiana’s Response to Instruction (RTI) model. Of the 11 reading standards, numbers 1-3 are foundational, numbers 4-9 reflect pedagogy and reading comprehension, and numbers 10-11 reflect expectations and the leadership role of the teacher in the environment of reading. Ms. White pointed out key words and phrases in each of the 11 standards.

Mr. Woebkenberg and board members thanked the presenters and Mr. Woebkenberg asked if board members had questions. Dr. Van Horn asked when the standards will be available to the public. Mr. Mapes indicated that feedback from Indiana educators is already “built in,” and there is no other scheduled public comment period. The board members will have access to the draft standards for review and comment on a secure website from the first week of October through Oct. 22. Dr. Van Horn asked if there was a way to release the draft standards for public review, but not for additional comment. Mr. Mapes explained the reluctance to have several versions of draft standards out on a public site because of confusion about which version was the most current. Following discussion it was agreed that following the November 10 board meeting, the draft standards would be posted on the OELD public website for viewing only, with the final adoption of the standards set for the meeting on December 21. Dr. Van Horn pointed out that some words used in the standards, such as “text,” seem limiting; Dr. Weiss agreed that the documents would be reviewed to replace terms that may be limiting.

Mr. Mapes shared with the board that he was recently involved in discussions with Dr. Bennett about the PARCC consortium--of which Indiana is a member--that is developing assessments based on the Common Core standards. A major emphasis of its work is literacy across content areas. Mr. Mapes is pleased at Indiana’s focus on reading and believes the new standards put Indiana at the front of the consortium’s work. Mr. Mapes praised Dr. Mast for all her hard work under a short timeline on this project and thanked all those who participated in the reviews for their hard work and diligence.

Mr. Woebkenberg reminded the board of its future meeting dates of November 10 and December 21. A motion for adjournment was made and seconded. The motion passed and the meeting adjourned.